



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/578,493

05/05/2006

Laurent Desire

67987.000002

7885

21967 7590 03/28/2008

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1649

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/578,493	Applicant(s) DESIRE, LAURENT	
	Examiner Olga N. Chernyshev	Art Unit 1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 and 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 May 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/5/6</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>sequence alignment, one page</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III in the reply filed on January 22, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-11 and 15-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 22, 2008.

Claims 12-14 are under examination in the instant office action.

Sequence compliance

2. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 (a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 through 1.825. Specifically, no sequence identification has been provided for the amino acid sequence of BACE501 presented in Figure 1, and also sequences presented at p. 4, line 4 and p. 26, line13 of the instant specification. In case these sequences are new, Applicant needs to provide a substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of a "Sequence Listing" which includes all of the sequences that are present in the instant application and encompassed by these rules, a substitute paper copy of that "Sequence Listing", an amendment directing the entry of that paper copy into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 (e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d). The instant specification will also need

Art Unit: 1649

to be amended so that it complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.821(d) which requires a reference to a particular sequence identifier (SEQ ID NO:) be made in the specification and claims wherever a reference is made to that sequence. See M.P.E.P. 2422.04.

Drawings

3. The figures of the instant application are presented on separate pages or in separate panels. 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(u) (1) states that in cases when figures present partial views of a drawing, which are intended to form one complete view, whether contained on one or several sheets, the figures must be identified by the same number followed by a capital letter. For example, the two panels of Figure 1 in the instant specification should be renumbered “Figure 1A” – “Figure 1B” rather than “Figure 1”. Applicant is reminded that once the drawings are changed to meet the separate numbering requirement of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(u) (1), the specification should be amended to change the Brief Description of the Drawings and the rest of the specification to refer to each Figure accordingly. If, for example, Figure 1 is divided into Figures 1A-1B, then the Brief Description and all the references to this figure in the specification must refer to this Figure in the same manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 12-14 fail to include any limitations which would distinguish the claimed ligands, polypeptides and antibodies from those which occur in nature. In the absence of the hand of man, naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. 303, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). The claims should be amended, if supported by the specification, to indicate the hand of the inventor, e.g., by insertion of “Isolated” or “Purified” as taught by the specification. Applicant should point to the basis in the specification for any amendment to the claims. See MPEP 2105.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claims 12 and 14 are vague and indefinite in so far as it employs the term “BACE455” as a limitation. This term is appears to be novel, and without a reference to a precise amino acid sequence identified by a proper SEQ ID NO: one cannot determine the metes and bounds of “BACE455”. Moreover, because the instant specification does not identify that property or combination of properties which is unique to and, therefore, definitive of a “BACE455”, an artisan cannot determine if a compound which meets all of the other limitations of a claim would then be included or excluded from the claimed subject matter by the presence of this limitation.

Art Unit: 1649

9. Regarding claim 12, the phrase "able to" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether this limitation is a part of the claimed invention. Specifically, the instant specification fails to present any clarification as how to determine and distinguish the selective binding ability of ligands, which makes the scope of the claimed subject matter vague and ambiguous.

10. Further, claims 12 and 14 are vague and indefinite for recitation of "a distinctive fragment". The metes and bounds of the limitation cannot be determined from the claims or the instant specification, as filed.

11. Claim 12 encompasses a ligand able to bind BACE455 "or a distinctive fragment thereof" and it is not obvious if it is the fragment of the ligand being claimed or the fragment is recited to define the ligand. Clarification is required.

12. Claim 13 is indefinite for recitation "a derivative of an antibody". The instant specification fails to define the limitation and therefore, the scope of the claimed subject matter cannot be positively appraised.

13. Also, claim 13, as written, lacks clarity because it defines the claimed product as a ligand comprising "a polypeptide comprising an antibody". Perhaps, "the ligand of claim 12, wherein the ligand is an antibody etc." would better express the claimed subject matter.

14. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

15. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 12 is directed to a ligand able to selectively bind a BACE455 polypeptide or a fragment thereof. The claim does not require that the ligand belongs to a certain class of molecules, possesses any particular conserved structure or other disclosed distinguishing feature. Thus, the claim is drawn to a genus of molecules that is defined only by the ability to selectively bind a BACE polypeptide or to fragments of those molecules (see also section 11 of the instant office action). However, the instant specification fails to describe the entire genus of molecules, which are encompassed by these claims. In making a determination of whether the application complies with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, it is necessary to understand what Applicant has possession of and what Applicant is claiming. From the specification, it is clear that Applicant has possession of antibodies that bind a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2. The claim, however, is drawn to any ligand or fragment thereof that binds BACE455. Thus, the claims are not limited to a protein with a specific amino acid sequence or to an antibody that binds a polypeptide of the specific amino acid sequence. The claims only require the claimed ligands (or fragments thereof) to bind BACE455 (or fragment thereof). The specification only describes antibodies that bind polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 and fails to teach or describe any other ligand which lacks the description of antibodies that bind to polypeptide of amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 and has any relevance to BACE455.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claim is a recitation of ability to bind BACE455. There is not even identification of a chemical class of the ligand or any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. The specification does not provide a complete structure of those ligands with ability to selectively bind BACE455 and fails to provide a representative number of species for the claimed genus. Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of ligands, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required.

See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated antibodies that bind polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 2, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,420,534, Gurney et al, 07/2002, '534 patent from hereafter.

Claims 12-14 are directed to a ligand that binds BACE455, a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2. '534 Patent discloses polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 6, hu Asp2(b), see column 7 (5-10) and column 13 (55-60), which has 99.2% sequence identity with the instant BACE455 polypeptide of

Art Unit: 1649

SEQ ID NO: 2, see sequence alignment attached to the instant office action. At column 25 (35-55), '534 patent discloses antibodies that bind to the hu Asp2(b), thus fully meeting the limitations of the instant claims 12-14.

Double Patenting

18. Applicant is advised that should claim 13 be found allowable, claim 14 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Conclusion

19. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey J. Stucker can be reached on (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1649

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

March 25, 2008

/Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1649